

ORIGINAL

BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

36 EAST SEVENTH STREET

SUITE 2110

CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202

TELEPHONE (513) 421-2255

TELECOPIER (513) 421-2764



0000067184

OSRB

RECEIVED

2007 FEB 16 A 11:48

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCUMENT CONTROL

Via Overnight Mail

February 15, 2007

Arizona Corporation Commission
Attn: Docket Filing Window
1200 Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Re: Docket No. E-01345A-05-0816

E-01345A-05-0826

Dear Sir or Madam:

E-01345A-05-0827

Please find enclosed the original and thirteen (13) copies of the Reply Brief of the Kroger Co. in the above-referenced matter.

All parties of record have been served. Please place this document of file.

Very Truly Yours,

Michael L. Kurtz, Esq.

Kurt J. Boehm, Esq.

BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY


MLKkew
Attachments

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that true copy of the foregoing was served by regular U.S. mail (unless otherwise noted), this 15th day of February, 2007 to the following:

	Gary Yaquinto	Arizona Utiltiy Investors Association Phoenix, Arizona 85004	1/12/2007
	Tammie Woody	10825 W. Laurie Ln. Peoria, Arizona 85345	8/23/2006
	Joseph Knauer	Jewish Community of Sedona Sedona, Arizona 86339	8/23/2006
	David Kennedy	818 E Osborn Rd Suite 103 Phoenix, Arizona 85014-0000	8/23/2006
	Andrew Bettwy	5241 Spring Mountain Rd. Las Vegas, Nevada 98150	8/17/2006
	Jay Moyes	1850 N. Central Ave. - 1100 Phoenix, Arizona 85004	8/17/2006
	Kenneth Saline	160 N. Pasadena - 101 Mesa, Arizona 85201	8/17/2006
	Sean Seitz	3008 N. Civic Center Plaza Scottsdale, Arizona 85251	8/17/2006
	Greg Patterson	916 W. Adams - 3 Phoenix, Arizona 85007	8/17/2006
	Amanda Ormond	7650 S. McClintock, Ste. 103-282 Tempe , Arizona 85284	8/17/2006
	George Bien-Willner	3641 N. 39th Ave. Phoenix, Arizona 85034	7/26/2006
	Lawrence Robertson, Jr.	Munger Chadwick PO Box 1448 Tubac, Arizona 85646	3/15/2006
	Lieutenant Colonel Karen White	139 Barnes Dr. Tyndall AFB, Florida 32403	2/15/2006
	Robert Geake	PO Box 29006 Phoenix, Arizona 85038-9006	2/6/2006
	Donna Bronski	3939 Drinkwater N. Blvd. Scottsdale, Arizona 85251	1/26/2006
	Tracy Spoon	12630 N. 103rd Ave. -144 Sun City, Arizona 85351	1/3/2006
	Michelle Livengood	One South Church St. Ste. 200 Tucson, Arizona 85702	1/3/2006
	Douglas Fant	3655 W. Anthem Way -A-109 PMB 411 Anthem, Arizona 85086	1/3/2006
	Bill Murphy	5401 N. 25 St. Phoenix, Arizona 85016	1/3/2006
	Jim Nelson	12621 N. 17 Place Phoenix, Arizona 85022	1/3/2006

	Dan Austin	6509 W. Frye Rd. Ste. 4 Chandler, Arizona 85226	1/3/2006
	Scott Wakefield	1110 W. Washington St. - 220 Phoenix, Arizona 85007	1/3/2006
	Michael Patten	One Arizona Center, 400 E. Van Buren St. - 800 Phoenix, Arizona 85004-3906	1/3/2006
	Timothy Hogan	202 E. McDowell Rd. - 153 Phoenix, Arizona 85004	12/14/2005
	C. Webb Crockett	3003 N. Central Ave. - 2600 Phoenix, Arizona 85012-2913	11/22/2005
	Thomas Mumaw	PO Box 53999 Phoenix, Arizona 85072-3999	11/22/2005
	Ernest Johnson	1200 W. Washington Phoenix, Arizona 85007-2927	11/4/2005
	Chris Kempley	1200 W. Washington Phoenix, Arizona 85007-2927	11/4/2005
	Lyn Farmer	1200 W. Washington Phoenix, Arizona 85007-2927	11/4/2005
	Deborah Scott	One Arizona Center 400 E. Van Buren St Phoenix, Arizona 85004-0000	11/4/2005


 Michael L. Kurtz, Esq.
 Kurt J. Boehm, Esq.

BEFORE THE
ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION

RECEIVED

In the Matter of the Application of)
Arizona Public Service Company for)
A Hearing to Determine the Fair Value of the)
Utility Property of the Company for Ratemaking)
Purposes, to Fix a Just and Reasonable Rate of Return)
Thereon, To Approve Rate Schedules Designed to)
Develop Such Return and to Amend Decision No. 67744)

2007 FEB 16 A 11:48

Docket No. E-01345A-05-0816)
E-01345A-05-0826)
E-01345A-05-0827)

REPLY BRIEF OF THE KROGER CO.

The Kroger Co. ("Kroger") submits this Brief in reply to the Initial Post-Hearing Brief of the Arizona Public Service Company ("APS" or "the Company").

1. The Particular Methodology Used To Conduct A Cost Of Service Study Is Irrelevant If The Allocation Of Rates Between The Customer Classes Ignores The Results Of That Cost Of Service Study.

On pages 90 through 92 of its Brief, APS defends the reasonableness of its cost-of-service study and engages Staff in a debate concerning the relative merits of using a "4 coincident peak" ("4CP") cost of service methodology versus the "peak and average" cost of service methodology. Although Kroger has previously noted that it supports the Company's use of the 4CP method¹ the controversy concerning which method is more appropriate is entirely academic if the Company's rate allocation proposal is accepted because the Company simply ignored the results of its own cost of service study when it designed its rates. In its Brief, APS concedes that its proposal does not take cost of service into account:

"[U]nder APS's proposed rate design, the major classes of customers - Residential, General Service, Irrigation, Street Lighting, and Dusk to Dawn - would each receive a percentage increase that is approximately the same as the overall requested increase, even though strict adherence to the results of the cost-of-service study would require higher increases are supportable."²

¹ Initial Brief of Kroger pp. 2-3.

² Initial-Post Hearing Brief of Arizona Public Service Company p. 86.


ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION
DOCKETED
FEB 16 2007

DOCKETED BY	KLC
-------------	-----

The Company's cost of service study reveals that the General Service customer class is currently paying over \$40 million in subsidies to the Residential class. However, APS's proposal ignores these results and recommends a rate increase to every customer class that is "*approximately the same as the overall requested increase.*" This would increase the subsidy paid by the General Service class from over \$40 million to over \$60 million.³ Whether the Commission accepts APS's or Staff's cost of service methodology is immaterial if the results of those studies are disregarded in setting rates.

It seems that everyone is in agreement that "*strict adherence*" to the cost of service results in setting rates is inappropriate given the impact such a policy would have on the rates of the Residential class. However, it is also imperative that the cost of service results not be ignored as the Company has done in its proposal. Kroger and Phelps Dodge Mining Company ("Phelps Dodge")/Arizonans for Electric Choice and Competition ("AECC") have submitted proposals that address the subsidy problems revealed by the cost of service results while keeping with the principle of gradualism so as to not levy a sudden and drastic increase to the subsidized customers.⁴ Kroger recommends that the Commission take the incremental, but vitally important step of addressing interclass subsidies as proposed by Phelps Dodge/AECC and Kroger.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael L. Kurtz, Esq.

Kurt J. Boehm, Esq.

BOEHM, KURTZ & LOWRY

36 East Seventh Street, Suite 1510

Cincinnati, Ohio 45202

Ph: (513) 421-2255 Fax: (513) 421-2764

mkurtz@BKLLawfirm.com

kboehm@BKLLawfirm.com

COUNSEL FOR THE KROGER CO.

February 15, 2007

³ Initial Brief of Kroger p. 6.

⁴ Kroger's rate allocation proposal is summarized in its Initial Brief at pp. 2-9. Phelps Dodge/AECCs' rate allocation proposal is summarized in its Closing Brief at pp. 23-25.